

5.

A N
ANSWER
To a late
Printed Paper,
Given about by some of the
CHURCH
O F
ROME.

In a LETTER to a GENTLEMAN.

The Second Edition.

Rev. 2. 5. *Remember from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works, or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy Candlestick out of his place, except thou repent.*

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Walter Kestilby*, at the Bishop's Head in
St. Paul's Church-Yard. 1686.

THE Popish Paper.

*Rom. 1. 8.
Rom. 16.
Rom. 6.
White, de-
fence of
his Way. p.
435.
K. ng Jam.
in his
Speech to
the Parlia-
ment.
Whitaker
in his An-
swer to D.
Sand.
2 Demonst.
Fulk. in c.
22. Thef.
Sect. 7.
Reynolds
in his 5th
Conclufi-
on.

IT will not be denied but that the Church of *Rome* was once a most pure, excellent, flourishing and Mother * Church.

This Church could not cease to be such, but she must fall either by Apostasie, Heresie or Schism.

I. Apostasie is not onely a renouncing of the Faith of Christ, but the very Name and Title to Christianity: No Man will say, that the Church of *Rome* had ever such a fall, or fell thus.

II. Heresie is an adhesion to some private and singular Opinion, or Error in Faith, contrary to the general approved Doctrine of the Church.

If the Church of *Rome* did ever adhere to any singular or new Opinion, disagreeable to the common received Doctrine of the Christian World, I pray satisfie me as to these particulars, viz.

1. By what General Council was she ever condemned?
2. Which of the Fathers ever writ against her? Or,
3. By what Authority was she otherwise reproved? For, It seems to me a thing very incongruous, that so great a Church should be condemned by every one that hath a mind to condemn her.

III. Schism is a departure or division from the Unity of the Church, whereby the Band and Communion held with some former Church, is broken and dissolved.

If ever the Church of *Rome* divided her self by Schism from any other Body of faithfull Christians, or brake Communion, or went forth from the Society of any Elder Church: I pray satisfie me as to these particulars.

1. Whose Company did she leave?
2. From what Body did she go forth?
3. Where was the true Church which she forsook?

For it appears a little strange to me, that a Church should be accounted Schismatical, when there cannot be assigned any other Church different from her, (which from Age to Age, since Christ his time, hath continued visible,) from whence she departed.

To my honoured Friend, Mr. S. B.

SIR,

I Had no sooner perused the Paper which I received from you, but I perceived that it was penn'd for the sake of such, as either are not well acquainted with the matters in Controversie betwixt us and the Church of *Rome*, or with the Way and Method of arguing. To such as these they are wont to pretend high: To those that are ignorant of the former, they talk of Antiquity and Universality; and to such as are unskilfull in the latter, of Demonstrations, and self-evident Principles, of Axioms and Definitions. But all this is a mere flourish of Words; for if these things come strictly to be examined, instead of Antiquity we shall too frequently find Forgery and Imposture; instead of the *Catholick* Church, the Church of *Rome*; instead of Demonstrations and Definitions, Sophistry and Fallacious Arguments. And after this strain is this Paper wrote, in which things are so artificially mingled, that they look very speciously to those that do not understand them; and are so well fitted to work upon the easie, the ignorant, and inconsiderate, that after it had been printed, as I perceive, long since in *Fiat Lux*, it is again singled out, to be put into the Hands of such as they have a design upon. But I shall endeavour to unravel it, and hope, by that time that I have done, that what is therein said will appear to be wholly insufficient to justify their Church, and acquit it of those Crimes it is charged with: And this I shall doe by shewing.

First, That the whole is false.

Secondly, That the particulars are very fallacious.

The former I shall make good by these following Considerations:

I. That a Church may fall from what it once was.

II. That the Church of *Rome* is not now what it was in Apostolical and Primitive times; when it might most of all pretend to be (as he calls it) *a most pure, excellent, and flourishing Church.*

III. That the alteration from what it was then, to what it is now, is to the worse; and that it is thereby intolerably corrupted.

If these Propositions be proved, then the way taken by our Author will signify nothing; since it will not be worth the while to enquire how it is, whether it be fallen by Apostasie, Heresie, or Schism, when it is demonstrable that so it is, that it is fallen.

I. That a Church may fall from what it once was; that is, from its primitive Purity and Simplicity in Faith and Manners, is evident to any that will read the Scriptures, and mind what is therein said of the Churches of the *Jews, Sardis* and *Laodicea*; or that are acquainted with Ecclesiastical History. And this they of the Church of *Rome* are bound to grant; who must acknowledge, according to their own Principles, that we once were a Church, when in their Communion; and that call us Apostatical, Heretical, and what not, since we have forsaken it.

H. That the Church of *Rome* is not now what it was in Apostolical and Primitive times, but is changed in Principles and Practice.

First, In Principles, as,

x. That the Pope is Christ's Vicar; that is, that he is the Universal Pastor over Christ's Flock, and hath a Jurisdiction over all Churches whatsoever, is a new Principle.

ple. This the Scripture (which the Church of Rome of old used to appeal to) is so far from giving any Countenance to, that our Saviour expressly cautions the Apostles against any such Usurpation. Luk. 22. 25. *When there was a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest; he said unto them, The Kings of the Gentiles exercise Lordship over them, &c. but it shall not be so: but he that is the greatest [or will be great, Mark 10. 43.] among you, let him be as the younger, &c. and in the 30. v. saith, ye shall sit upon twelve Thrones, &c. not preferring one before the other. And lest what he had occasionally spoke to Peter, Mat. 16. 19. Whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven, &c. should be misconstrued, he doth give the same power to the rest of the Apostles, both before his Death, Mat. 18. 18. and also after his Resurrection, Joh. 20. 23. And if we would understand the sense of Antiquity, as to this matter, I know no surer nor shorter way, than to see what is said by the Councils; for then the Fathers may be supposed to speak most impartially and with greatest authority; and of this I shall give you a brief Account. The first general Council was that of Nice, called by Constantine the Great, and held An. 325. which in the sixth Canon doth thus decree, *That the Bishop of Alexandria, and accordingly of Antioch, and of other Provinces, should have power over their own Provinces, according to ancient Custome, and the Custome in that case of the Church of Rome; and that none should invade the Privileges of each other.* The same is said and confirmed in the second Canon of the second general Council held at Constantinople by the command of Theodosius the Emperour, An. 380. And farther ratified by the third general Council at Ephesus, in the Year 431. Can. 8.*

If we go forward, we shall find that it was farther decreed in the abovesaid Council of Constantinople, Can. 3. *That the Bishop of Constantinople should have the order*

of

of Primacy next to the Bishop of Rome, because it is New Rome. And what is thereby to be understood, is sufficiently declared in the 28th Canon of the Fourth General Council assembled at Chalcedon, An. 451. in which it is decreed, *That the Church of Constantinople should have equal Privileges with that of Rome, there being the same Reason for that as the other, as it was the Imperial Seat:* and accordingly is there a particular Instance given in case of Appeals, *Can. 9.* From this Jurisdiction which every Church had over its own Members, proceeded other Canons; as, *That those who were excluded the Communion of one Church, should not be received by another;* so *Can. 5.* of the aforesaid Council of Nice. *That no Appeals should be made to foreign or transmarine Churches;* so the Council held at Milevis in Africa, (where S. Augustine was present,) *An. 416. Can. 22.* which Canon † Bellarmine confesseth was made with a particular respect to Rome. To the same purpose the sixth Council held at Carthage, *An. 420.* (in which also S. Augustine was) passed a Decree*. From all which you may observe,

1. That the Bishop of Rome had anciently a limited Jurisdiction, it was over his own Province onely.
2. That the Jurisdiction which he had over his own Province was such as all other Supreme Bishops had over theirs.
3. That none had a power to transgress the ancient and settled bounds of Jurisdiction, or to invade those of others.
4. That the Honour given to the Bishop of Rome (whatever priority it was that he had) was not by any Divine Authority, but as Rome was the Imperial Seat.
5. That the Honour and Privilege which it had by that means, was what another was capable of; for the same was given to Constantinople.
6. That none of these Decrees in those General Councils were ever opposed by the Church of Rome, till the Council of Chalcedon.
7. That at that time the pretences of the Pope's Legates were universally opposed and rejected.
- And I may add,
8. That

† L. 2. de
Rom. Pon.
cap. 24.

* Can. 31.

8. That what was at any time in those days claimed by the Church of *Rome*, was claimed not upon any Divine Authority, but onely upon the Authority of the Council of *Nice*, (as it appears from the transactions in the afore-cited Council of *Carthage*.) 9. What was then claimed under that pretext, was upon a pretended, if not a forged, Canon of the Council of *Nice*, which was detected so to be by that Council of *Carthage*, and their Usurpation rejected, as is evident from the Acts of that Council, and the Epistle written by the Fathers there assembled, to Pope *Celestine* upon it.

From all which it appears (and more I could shew) that there was no such thing originally, as this Universal Pastorship, which the Bishop of *Rome* doth now challenge, and that *Rome* is therein changed from what it was.

And now let our Authour ask (if he please) *by what Councils was the Church of Rome ever condemned?* And you may answer, by the four first general Councils. Let him ask again, *Which of the Fathers ever wrote against her?* And you may answer, no less than 1068. for so many were then convened in all these four Councils. And if this suffice not, we may turn him to the Councils of *Milevis* and *Carthage* before mentioned, and to others also of good Authority, besides particular Fathers. I have been the longer upon this, not onely because it could not be well comprised in less, but also because if this Claim of theirs fall, their Cause must fall with it.

2. Another new Principle of theirs is, That the Pope hath at least, *in ordine ad Spiritualia*, a Power over all Kingdoms within the Church, and of deposing Kings in case of Heresie, or Obstinacy, &c. and of absolving Subjects from their Allegiance to them when thus deposed. That this is the Principle of their Church is plain from *Can. 3.* of the Fourth Council of *Lateran*, and from the Council of *Trent*, in *Sess. 25. de reform. c. 19.* where it

is somewhat covertly expressed, for a Reason which the state of Affairs at that time made necessary. That this is the Doctrine of their Church, is proved beyond all contradiction, by the present Lord Bishop of *Lincoln*, in his late Learned Treatise *Of Popery, &c.*

But that this Doctrine of theirs is *new*, is commonly confessed among themselves, and maintained so to be by several of their own Communion, and which any one may so far receive satisfaction in, from what is written by *Roger Widdrington* (*alias Preston*) in his *Apologia pro Fure Principum*, and his *Humillima Supplicatio ad Paulum Quintum*.

3. Transubstantiation was not originally an Article of their Creed, as it is now. So it is said by *Jo. Tribarn*,
* Comment. in 4. Sent. Scoti. l. 4. Dist. 11. *an approved Authour of theirs, In primitiva Ecclesia de substantia fidei erat, &c. It was of the substance of Faith in the primitive Church, to believe that the Body of Christ was contained under the species of Bread and Wine; but it was not of Faith, that the substance of the Bread should be turned into the Body of Christ, and upon Consecration should not be Bread. For, saith he, this was not found out by the Church till the time of Innocent the Third, in the Council of Lateran, where many Truths that before lay hid are explained in the Chap. of Firmiter Credimus, amongst which, this of Transubstantiation is the chief. So also saith*
Q. 3. dist. 42. Sect. 1. *Peter Tatarer†. And this was the Opinion of Scotus*, the great Schoolman.*

† Com. in 4. Sent. p. 101. col. 1. Ven. 1607. and p. 142. col. 1.
 * In 4. Sent. dist. 11. q. 3. SS. ad argument. pro prima & dist. 10. q. 1. SS. quantum ergo. † Bellarmine l. 3. de Euchar. c. 23.

Now it is supposed that *Scotus*, who lived within 150 Years after, must better understand what was the Doctrine of their Church before it, and what was the sense of that Council concerning it, than he that comes about 450 Years after, and chides him for so doing, with a *minime probandum†*.

4. The Doctrine of Infallibility, respecting their Church as the Seat of it, was not anciently known, neither claimed by themselves, nor granted by others. Amongst

Amongst all the directions given in Scripture for finding out the truth, there is not one word to this purpose; and amongst all the Disputes in the Primitive Church, we find no such course taken for the final determination of them, as the having recourse to the Apostolical Chair of *Rome*. Heresies were not then so scarce, nor the confutation of them so easie, as that this relief should be forgotten. And it seems they themselves did then as little understand their own Privileges, as they did the Principles of Faith; for this was never so much as thought of, in all those Councils which were called on purpose for the suppression of Heresies, and where the Legats of the Pope were present: Nay to this very day they are at a loss where to go for it, whether to the Pope, or a Council, or both, or Tradition, or the Collective Body of Christians; that is, they know not whether to give up the Cause or to maintain it. I must confess, if I should hear a person solemnly declare, that he hath Treasure enough in his possession to enrich the whole World, and should gravely invite all persons to address themselves to him, but in the mean time perceive (though he hath been of the same Mind for several Years,) that he can neither tell where it is, nor is he and his Family for all this the richer, or in a better condition than other Folk, I should vehemently suspect him either to be a notorious Impostor, or perfect Lunatick. And when we hear the Church of *Rome* confidently asserting its own Infallibility, but find withall that she knows not where to fix it, and that its ruptures and differences are in the mean time as great as in other Churches, and what are never ended by the way it pretends to, but by plain downright force, I cannot for my heart but think there is for the most part more of Interest than Reason in the Case, and what they themselves do rather live by than believe.

But in my mind there is no better Evidence that this is new, than that it's false; and no better evidence that it is false, than that it hath mistaken. Of which, besides what hath been, or shall be farther said of alterations in that Church, I shall give you two plain Instances, The Council of Trent† saith, that *Traditions are to be received with equal reverence as the Scriptures*; and *Mal-donat* * tells us, that *The giving the Eucharist to Children, was a Tradition in the Church for 600 Tears after Christ*; which is now condemned (as he shews) by the Council of Trent. Again, *S. Hierom* † saith, that *the Latine Church then did not receive the Epistle to the Hebrews amongst the Canonical Scriptures*: But that is now taken into the number by them, and required so to be under an Anathema, *Seff. 4. Decr. 1. Conc. Trid.* Now Infallibility and Fallibility are contradictory, and if that Church hath erred, (as erred she hath) then she cannot be infallible, and so consequently the Infallibility of the Church of Rome was not the Principle of the Primitive Church of Rome.

I could shew as much of Novelty in the Doctrines of Indulgences, Purgatory, the Mass's being a Propitiatory Sacrifice, and of no Salvation out of the *Romish Church*, &c. but what I have said I think is sufficient.

Secondly, The Alterations are as great in point of Practice; the Church of Rome differs therein as much from what she originally was: As,

1. The keeping the Scriptures and publick Service in an unknown Tongue, is new. The first is evident from the Translations of the Scripture into several Languages, and especially into the Latine, (at that time a vulgar Tongue) of which no sufficient Reason can be given, were it not for the use of those that understood not the Originals. The latter is not onely clear from *1 Cor. 14.* but what *Bellarmino* * doth acknowledge; who saith, *that the custome of the Peoples saying Amen, [that is to what they understood,] as they did in the Apostles time,*

† *Seff. 4. decr. 1.*

* *Com. in Job. 6. p. 317.*

† *In IJa. c. 6. & c. 8.*

* *De Verbo Dei, lib. 2. cap. 16.*

continued long in the Western as well as Eastern Church.

2. Worshipping of Images, which was first established in the second Council at *Nice*; but is so different from and contrary to the practice of the Primitive Church, that *Cassander*† (an Authour of theirs) saith, *that the Christians had not then so much as Images in their Churches*; and doth farther declare from *Origen*, that the Ancients *ab omni veneratione* (the very word used by the Council of *Trent*, *Sess. 25. decret. de Invocat.*) *imaginum abhorrerunt*, that all Veneration of them was abhorred. To this I refer the worshipping of Saints, which was so little thought of, that many of the Fathers did not think that the Souls of any should enjoy the beatifick Vision, and be in a state of happiness till the Resurrection, as *Stapleton** doth shew. And it seems not to have been an Article of Faith in the time either of *Lombard* or *Scotus*, the former of which saith† *it's not incredible the Saints do hear what we say*; and the latter* that *it's probable God doth reveal our prayers that are offered unto them*. It was then the Doctrine of probability only, but now all are required to believe it under an *Anathema*, by the Council of *Trent*†.

† Consult.
Artic. 21.
sect. 4.

* Defens.
Ecl. cont.
Whitaker,
l. 1. c. 2.
Tom. 1.
p. 868.
† Sent. l. 4.
dist. 45.
* In 4. dist.
45. Q. 4.
† Sess. 25.
de Invocat.

As much is to be said concerning the Innovation of Worship to the Virgin *Mary*, of which we read nothing in Scripture or Antiquity, unless in what was practised by the Hereticks, called *Collyridiani* in *Epiphanius*||, || *Heres. 79.* that used to carry about her Image, and offer Cakes and Worship to it; with whom that good Father thus encounters; *What Scripture hath delivered any such thing, &c. Let Mary be in honour, but let the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost be worshipped; let no man worship Mary*.

3. Communion in one Kind expressly contrary to the Scripture, and the former practice of the *Ramish* Church. The former is acknowledged by the Council of *Constance* when they decreed with a notwithstanding for it. * *Sess. 13.*

The

† *Artic. 22.* The latter is acknowledged by *Cassander*†, who saith, *that the Roman Church it self retained the practise of receiving in both Kinds, for above one thousand years after Christ, as is evident from innumerable testimonies of ancient Writers.*

To these I might add the practise of saying private and solitary Masses, of the Adoration of the Host, and carrying it about in Procession, Confession, (as used in their Church,) &c. But I shall forbear.

III. These alterations are to the worse, and gross Corruptions. For if the Pope is not Christ's Vicar originally, and by his Deputation, then he is so far a great Usurper. If he hath not a Power over Kings, to depose them, and absolve their Subjects from Allegiance to them, then those of them that have used that power have been notorious disturbers of the World. If their Church be not infallible, and can no more penetrate into, or resolve and determine points of Faith than another, they do deceive and are deceived. If Transubstantiation be a Doctrine of their own, and not of Christ's, they usurp upon his Prerogative. If the Scriptures are free to all, then their Church is guilty of the damnation of all amongst themselves, that perish through the want of knowing and understanding them; and of all the ignorance in the Christian World, which proceeds from that cause. If worshipping Images, Saints and Angels, the Host, and Relicks, be not Christian Doctrine, and that these are no lawfull Objects of such Worship, then they are Idolaters. If Christians are obliged to partake of the Wine as well as the Bread in the Lord's Supper, then what are they that deny and forbid it? In fine, they that doe such things are no Friends to the Kingdom of Christ and the Christian World.

If all this be true, that a Church may fall from what it once was, and be altered to the worse, and that theirs is so, then we need not spend time in disposing what

Apostasy, Heresie and Schism is; upon which we may talk prettily and subtilly; or by which of them that Church is saln, as long as saln she is. But yet to clear the matter of all wrangling Disputes, I shall consider these things also; and shew,

Secondly, That the particulars are very fallacious; which will appear from the consideration of the several Terms.

1. *Most pure, excellent, flourishing Mother Church*; of all which little or nothing is said in the places of Scripture quoted by him in the Margin. If we consult the Epistle to the *Romans*, there referred to, we shall find, That it was so far from being at that time a *flourishing Church*, that it is there not once so much as called a Church. The Apostle directs two Epistles to the Church in *Corinth*, and two to the Church of the *Thessalonians*, and one to the Churches of *Galatia*; but to the *Romans* he writes thus, *Ch. 1. v. 7. To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be Saints*; as if they were yet Converts at large, without any other settled Constitution, than what was in the House of *Aquila*, which he therefore calls a Church, *Ch. 16. v. 5.* And therefore *Salmeron*, aware of it, thinks *St. Paul* would not call them a Church purposely, *because of the Factions that were there at that time betwixt the Jews and Gentiles.* *Tom. 13. in Rom. 1. disp. 7. p. 299. col. 2.*

But if we should grant it a Church; yet how doth that, *Rom. 1. 8.* prove that it was *flourishing*, when it's onely said there, *Your Faith is spoken of throughout the whole World*; and in *Ch. 16. v. 19.* (for I suppose that is the other place he would refer to) *Your obedience is come abroad unto all Men*; by which doubtless no more is to be understood, but that the Conversion of many to Christianity in that City was spread throughout the *Roman World*; and did tend much to the propagation of it, as that City was then the Imperial Seat.

This

This is the explication given of this place by some of their own Writers, viz. *Rigaltius*, in his Notes upon *St. Cyprian*, *Epist.* p. 78. and *Tolet*, who in *c. 1. ad Rom. Annot.* 16. call it a true *Exposition*, and saith it's to be understood as *1 Thes. 1. 8.*

As for the Term *Mother*, I hope he means not that the Gospel first came from thence; for in that sense she was a Daughter, and not a Mother. And if any Church could pretend to any Authority from that consideration, it must be *Jerusalem*, which in this sense was the *Mother of us all*. But if he means thereby that she was an Original and Apostolical Church, planted by the Apostles, or in Apostolical times (for so *Tertullian* useth these Words alike; *lib. de præscript. cap. 21.* when he calls them *Matrices & Originales Ecclesia*, and again *Ecclesia Apostolica*) then such also was *Ephesus* in *Asia*, and *Corinth* in *Achaia*, &c. as *Tertullian* there shews, *c. 32.* and *36.* of which Churches it will be hard for him to find any thing remaining; and which, while they did remain, he must acknowledge to have faln, and been grossly corrupted. And therefore *Rome's* being a *Mother Church*, in this sense, is no security against *Apostasie*, *Heresie* and *Schism*.

2. *Apostasie*, he saith, is a renouncing not onely the Faith of Christ, but the very Name and Title to Christianity. This indeed is *Apostasie* with a Witness; but as it is no more than a Branch or particular kind of it, so it can be no complete or true definition of it. It being just as if he should say, that Theft is the violent and forcible taking away of another Man's Goods; which indeed is the highest degree of it, and what we usually call Robbery; but there are other sorts of Theft besides; and though it be never so surreptitiously and clandestinely done, it is as well Theft, and a breach of the Eighth Commandment as the other. So it is in the present case; the highest degree of *Apostasie* is a renouncing the
very

very name of Christian, the turning a *Renegado*, a *Turk*, or *Jew*: But that is Apostasie also, when there is a departure from the Faith of Christ, or from any great Article or Articles of it. And so far a person may be truly an Apostate, and yet retain the *Name and Title to Christianity*. I must confess, I always took those to be Apostates, whom the Apostle speaks of, *1 Tim. 4. 1.* that *depart from the Faith of Christ*, who yet seem to have continued in the profession of it. And I am apt to believe Antichrist will be thought an Apostate; and yet it's the opinion of many among themselves, that he shall retain the name of Christian. But if this will not doe, I must refer him to the *Bulla Cænæ* of Pope Paul the Fifth, where it's said in the first Article of it, *Excommunicamus, &c. We excommunicate and anathematise, &c. all Hussites, Wicklevists, Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calvinists, Hugonots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians, & à Christiana fide Apostatas, ac omnes & singulos alios Hæreticos, &c. and all Apostates from the Christian Faith, and all other Hereticks, &c.* which is doubtless spoken of such as have not, nor are supposed to have renounced the Name and Title to Christianity. So that either the Pope in one of his most solemn Bulls is mistaken, or this Gentleman: And if we take to the former, as I hope he either in modesty, or for a more important reason which he is privy to, will allow, then the Church of *Rome* may be saide by Apostasie, though she doth retain the Name and Title, and will needs be the onely Church of Christ.

3. *Herefie*, he saith, is an adhesion to some private or singular Opinion or Error in Faith, contrary to the general approved Doctrine of the Church. Before we admit this Definition, there are a great many things to be considered; as first, that the relation which he makes *Herefie* to have to the Doctrine of the Church, is not

current amongst themselves. For many of them do say, that Heresie is *nihil aliud quàm Error in rebus fidei cum pertinacia*, Heresie is nothing else than an Error in the matters of Faith with obstinacy, as Sayrus acknowledgeth in his *Clavius Sacerdotum*, l. 2. c. 9. n. 34. and Durand is of the same mind (notwithstanding what Sayrus saith of him to the contrary) as appears l. 4. dist. 13. Q. 5. where he makes the respect which Heresie hath to the Church, to be *because the Church is constituted, per unitatem fidei, by the unity of the Faith*: So that according to these, the respect which Heresie hath to the Church, is onely from the respect which the Church hath to the Faith: And to find out what Heresie is, we must enquire not what the Church is, but what is the Faith. And if so, a Church, even that of *Rome*, may fall by Heresie, though she may hold the general approved Doctrine of the Church. But I doubt if we should admit the whole, and yet take it in any sense but one, *viz.* for the general approved Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* in the last Ages of it, that we shall find her guilty in this point also. Shall the Church be taken for the primitive Church three or four hundred years after our Saviour, then they are guilty of Heresie who will have the Pope to be Christ's Vicar, and to have Jurisdiction over all Churches; that do maintain worshipping of Images, Angels and Saints, to be lawfull and necessary, &c. contrary to the general approved Doctrine of those Ages. Should we take the Church for the Church Catholick in any Age (as *Cassander* doth, *Consult. Artic. 22.*) that is, the Congregation of Christ's faithfull people all over the World, then still *Rome* would fall into the same condemnation, since that she is but a little part in comparison of the whole. Should we take Church again for the *Romish* Church in the first Ages of Christianity, it would then also condemn it self, as I have

have before shewed. And I see no way for them, even according to this definition, (which is perfectly one of their own making) to avoid this imputation, but by stiffly maintaining, that they thereby understand the Church of *Rome* for some Ages last past; if that will doe; and then we know where to find them, and what to understand when they talk of the Church.

4. *Schism*, he saith, is a departure from the Unity of the Church whereby the Band and Communion held with some former Church is broken. This is as lame and fallacious a definition as any of the rest. For by soisting in that word *Former*, which he after runs upon, he restrains it to one particular Branch of Schism; and its just as if he should say, *A Church is an Assembly of Christians that join in Communion with each other in the City of Rome*; which none will allow to be a sufficient definition of a Church: For that term added, *In the City of Rome*, doth no more than prove that the Assembly of Christians there met is a Church; but is no definition of a Church; for then no Church could be out of the City of *Rome*, and every Church, if it be a Church, must be in that City, and no where else, if that be a true definition of it. So it is here, the word *Former* added to the definition of Schism here given, doth prove no more than that a departure from the Unity of a Former Church is a *species* and sort of Schism, but is no adequate definition of it. For if it is, then no Church can be guilty of Schism, that doth, how unwarrantably soever, refuse to hold Communion with, or doth break off from the Communion of a Church that was not a Church before it. And consequently, though the Church of *Jerusalem* had denied to hold Communion with any Church whatsoever, (though it were even with the Church of *Rome* it self,) she could not be guilty of Schism, because she was the first Church, and

none was prior to her. And we also should be quit of that blame (if we had nothing else to say for our selves) forasmuch as a Church was founded here in *Britain* two years before that of *Antioch*; and *St. Peter* was seven years at *Antioch* before he presided at *Rome*, as *Baronius* saith, *An. 35. Num. 5.* and *An. 39. Numb. 23.* from whom, and from which time they pretend alone to derive their Supremacy.

And now this will hold, although the Church thus separated from had given no reason or colour at all for it. For according to the definition of our Authour, it must be a *Former Church* which the departure must be from to make it Schism. We may indeed say, that Schism is when the Band or Communion held with any Church, is (without just reason) broken and dissolved; because all Christian Churches ought to maintain Communion with each other, where it may be had: But if so, then the Church of *Rome* is the most Schismatical in the World, that denies Communion with all Churches that are not in all *Tridentine* points one with her.

If you now, Sir, reflect upon his Scheme and frame of Arguments, you will see that they hold in nothing which he produceth them for.

For what will it signifie, if it be granted that the Church of *Rome* was once a most pure, flourishing Church, if she be now abominably corrupted? What if she was a Mother Church planted by the Apostles, and watered with their Doctrine, and their Blood, when she now preacheth another Doctrine than she was taught by them, and hath grossly corrupted that Faith which they did there establish? What if she was a Mother-Church to some other Churches, yet, that as it gives her no Authority over those whom she was not in any sense a Mother to, so even not over such as she might pretend that Relation to, when she is now not

to be approached to, or held Communion with, without apparent hazard of Salvation; and is faln from those Principles and that Faith which she at their first conversion instructed them in? When she is faln by Apostasie, Heresie and Schism.

By Apostasie, as she hath forsaken the Primitive Church, and is not now what she originally was, either in Faith or Manners.

By Heresie, as she hath received new Articles of Faith, that were not such before; and so obstinately persisted therein, that she hath turned the Anathema upon all Dissenters in those points from her. Such Articles she hath embraced, and doth now hold, as have been *condemned by Councils, wrote against by Fathers, and reprov'd by Authority.*

Some of these she was particularly charged with, and reprov'd for; and in others she is as much concerned, as if particularly charged, because she hath embraced those things which were by them condemned. For if the things and principles were condemned, whoever holds them is as much so condemned by that Authority, as if particularly named. As they will acknowledge, that if a Church now in Communion with them should fall off from them, she is thereby as much under the *Anathema* of the Council of *Trent*, as if she had at the meeting of that Council been so far faulty, and thereby been particularly condemned.

By Schism she is faln, as she denies Communion with all other Churches in the World, whether they were so before she was a Church, or were Churches converted and established at the same time with her, or that have embraced the Christian Faith since she did. The company of such she hath left: From these Bodies she is gone forth: And these were the true Churches which she forsook. So that she will be found as often guilty of
Apo-

Apostasie as there are particulars of Faith, Doctrine, Worship and Manners, which she is false from the Primitive Church in. As often of Heresie, as she hath new Principles of Faith, and which the Church was not then acquainted with. As often of Schism, as there are Churches in the World, that she will not hold Communion with, onely because they will not embrace those Principles, or join with her in those practices which she holds contrary to them, and with them to the Primitive Church.

And thus, Sir, I have made good, I hope, what I first undertook, and if thereby any service can be done to you or our Religion, it will be a great satisfaction to,

S I R,

Your Servant.

F I N I S.

